

## **REMARKS**

The interview with examiner Linda Gray on May 31, 2005 is acknowledged with appreciation. The examiner's interview summary is accurate as to what transpired at the interview.

Non-elected claim 25 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

At the interview it was agreed that the prior art references to Fay (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,463) and Cameron et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,552,793) do not teach or suggest passing a fiberglass insulation blanket through a cutter to cut the fiberglass insulation blanket along a cut line to produce a cut that extends perpendicular to the major surface of the fiberglass insulation blanket to form two side-by-side separate strips separated by a gap, applying an adhesive material to at least one of the opposing longitudinally extending side edges, and joining the opposing longitudinally extending side edges together to cause the adhesive material to establish a frangible adhesive bridge spanning the gap between the opposing longitudinally extending side edges and establishing relatively weak internal bonds between the opposing longitudinally extending side edges of the two side-by-side strips as recited in claim 1. Fay joins the major surfaces, not side-by-side separate strips separated by a gap as recited in claim 1. Cameron et al applies adhesive to the upper major surface (column 5, lines 1-6) and twists each section before joining so that the cut surfaces form the upper and lower major surfaces of the new strip (column 5, lines 18-21). Thus Cameron et al does not have a step of applying an adhesive material to at least one of the opposing longitudinally extending side edges and joining the opposing longitudinally extending side edges together to cause the adhesive material to establish a frangible adhesive bridge spanning the gap between the opposing longitudinally extending side edges.

Claims 11, 24 and 26 recited similar limitations and avoid the prior art rejections of record.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the claims (Nos. 1-12, 15-18 and 24-34) are in condition for allowance and such action is, respectfully, requested.

The double patenting rejection was discussed and it was urged that the claims are sufficiently different to avoid the double patenting rejection. The examiner wished to further consider the need for a terminal disclaimer and will contact the undersigned if such is deemed necessary.

If there is any issue remaining to be resolved, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that resolution can be promptly effected.

A check for \$50 for one additional dependent claim is enclosed.

A request for a two-month extension of time accompanies this amendment. It is requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response with the fee for such extensions and shortages in other fees, being charged, or any overpayment in fees being credited, to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg, Deposit Account No. 10-0435 (20341-72276).

Respectfully submitted,

BARNES & THORNBURG



Richard B. Lazarus

Reg. No. 48,215

Tel. No. (202) 371-6348